



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## ARTICLE XII.

---

# ON THE POSITION OF THE VĀITĀNA-SŪTRA IN THE LITERATURE OF THE ATHARVA-VEDA.

BY MAURICE BLOOMFIELD,

PROFESSOR IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, BALTIMORE, MD.

---

Presented to the Society October 30th, 1884.

---

THE following pages contain an attempt to define more exactly than has as yet been done the position of the Vāitāna-sūtra in the literature of the Atharva-Veda. It is based upon a pretty thorough, though not exhaustive, comparison of the Vāitāna-sūtra with the Kāuṣika-sūtra and its commentary by Dārila. On several interesting points I was enlightened by the Ātharvaṇīya-paddhati, a second *paddhati* to the house-ritual of the Atharva-Veda, two modern copies of which, in the possession of the Royal Library at Berlin, I had the privilege of using for my forthcoming edition of the Kāuṣika. As this *paddhati* presents some special points of interest, I give here for the first time a short notice of it.

It differs from the Daṣa karmāni, of which I presented a short sketch at the meeting of the Society in October, 1883,\* in that it not merely paraphrases the description of certain sections of the ritual as given in the Kāuṣika, but also comments upon them somewhat independently, occasionally differing from Dārila. After a short introduction, it turns to the *paribhāṣa-sūtras* at the beginning of the Kāuṣika,† then continues with the *ājya-*

---

\* See the Proceedings of that meeting—where may be found also a short notice of the commentary of Dārila.

† The much more important and interesting *paribhāṣas* which are contained in chapters 7 and 8 of the Kāuṣika it does not treat in any way.

*tantra* (here called *brhatkuçandikā*: cf. the word *kuçandika* in Weber's catalogue of MSS., No. 1253), with its appendix the *uttaratantra*; then it treats the following *saṃskāras*: *garbhādhāna*, *pūṃsavana*, *śimantonayana*, *jātakarman*, *nāmakarāṇa*, *nirṇayana*, *annaprāṇa*, *godāna*, *cūdākarāṇa*, *upanayana* (with *vedāvratā*, *kalpavratā*, *mṛgāruvratā*!, *viśāsahivratā*\*), *samāvartana*, *vivāha* with *madhuparka* inserted (as in the *Dāṣa karmāṇi*, *Kāṭhaka-gr̥hya* and *Mānava-gr̥hya*),† *caturthīkarman* with the *madughamaniprāyaścitta*‡ as appendix, *laghuçālākarman*, *brhacchālākarman*, *çāntyudaka*, *sampatkāma*(-karman), *pustikāma*(-karman), *abhicāra*(-karman), *vṛddhiçrāddha*, *dahanavidhi* (with *asthisamcayana*), *piṇḍadāna*, *ṣoḍaṣopacāra*, and *vr̥tsarga*.

The text quotes the usual Atharvan literature: *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, *Vāitāna-sūtra*, *Nakṣatrakalpa*, *Āngirasakalpa*, and the *pariçiṣṭas*; also such stock-books as *Manu* and the *Karmapradīpa*.§ It also cites *Dārila*, and two other commentators, *Bhadra* and *Rudra*, both of whom are elsewhere unknown.|| It mentions further a *paddhati-kāra* by the name of *Keçava*; an *ācārya* *Upavaṛṣa* as author of *mīmāṃsā*;¶ a work called the *Pañcāpatalikā* (cf. Böhtlingk's lexicon), and finally *Pāṭhīnasi*. The latter is cited frequently and familiarly by *Dārila*; and it seems possible that the *smṛti* of *Pāṭhīnasi* may go back to a *dharma-sūtra* belonging to the *Atharva-Veda*. Often as this text is cited, no MS. of it has as yet come to light, as I learn from *Bühler* and *Jolly*; it would be interesting to find the *Sūtra*-ritual of the *Atharva-Veda* completed by a *dharma-sūtra*, or some *smṛti* going back to a *dharma-sūtra*. The name of a teacher *Māusalīputra Pāṭhīnasi* occurs also in *Ath. Pariç. 4. 3* and *17. 13*.

Indian tradition is unanimous in presenting the ritual literature immediately attaching itself to the *Atharva-Veda* as consisting of five *kalpas*. The *Caranavyūha* (*Ath. Pariç. 49*) presents them in the following order, and under the following names: *nakṣatrakalpa*, *vitānakalpa*, *samhitākalpa*, *āngirasakalpa*, and *çāntikalpa*. The larger *Caranavyūha*, the fifth *pariçiṣṭa* of the *White Yajur-veda*, counts *nakṣatrakalpa*, *vitānakalpa*, *samhitākalpa* (with the variant *samhitāvidhi*), *vidhānakalpa* (with the variant *abhicāra*), and *çāntikalpa*. The *Devīpurāṇa* (cited by *Weber*, *Ind. Stud. iii. 279*) counts *nakṣatra*, *vāitāna*, *samhitāvidhi*, *āngirasa*, and *çānti*. The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (*iii. 6*; *vol. iii. p. 63* of *Hall's* edition of *Wilson's* translation)\*\* knows these *kalpas* by the same name and in the same order as the *Ath. Pariçiṣṭa*. The

\* Cf. *AV. xvii. 1-5*.

† See *Proceedings A. O. S.*, loc. cit.; *Jolly*, *Das Dharma-sūtra des Viṣṇu und das Kāthakagr̥hyasūtra*, *Proceedings of the Munich Academy*, June, 1879, p. 76.

‡ Cf. *Atharva-pariçiṣṭa 37. 9* (MS. or. fol. 973 in the *Royal Library at Berlin*); cf. *Ind. Stud. v. 404*.

§ Cited as often under the name of *chandogapariçiṣṭa* of *Kātyāyana*.

¶ *dārilo rudrabhadraṇ ca trayas te bhāṣyakārāḥ*.

¶ Cf. *Colebrooke*, *Miscellaneous Essays*, ii. 322.

\*\* Cf. *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, ed. by *Rājendralālamitra*, *Introduction*, p. 5.

Ātharvaṇīya-paddhati also follows the Ath. Pariṣiṣṭa, but substitutes the name *abhicāra*kalpa for *āṅgīrasa*kalpa, and cites the guarantee of the *mīmāṃsā*-teacher Upavarṣa that these are *gr̥ti*, and that there are other *kalpas* which are *smṛti*.\* The Vāyupurāṇa (61; p. 526 of the edition in the Bibliotheca Indica) reads: *nakṣatrakalpo vāitānas tṛtīyaḥ saṁhītāvidhiḥ : caturtho 'ngīrasaḥ (!) kalpaḥ śāntīkalpaḥ ca pañcamah*. In the Mahābhārata, xii. 13258, the five *kalpas* of the Atharva-Veda are mentioned, but their names are not given. In the Bhāgavata-purāṇa xii. 7. 1,† the *kalpas* occur as: *nakṣatrakalpaḥ śāntiḥ ca kṣyapa-pāṅgīrasādayaḥ (!)*. In the Mahābhāṣya, there occur together several times the *kalpas* of Kāṣyapa and Kāuṣika (Ind. Stud. xiii. 417, 419, 436, 445, 455). Weber (ibid. 436 and 445) is disposed to see in this Kāuṣika and in the derivative Kāuṣikin the representatives of a Yajus-school; but this passage from the Bhāgavata-purāṇa shows clearly that the Kāuṣika of the Atharva-Veda is meant. But who is Kāṣyapa among the *kalpas*? Can there be any nexus between him and the otherwise authorless Vāitāna-sūtra?‡ The commentary to the Atharva-Veda by Sāyana, which Shankar Pandurang Pandit announced in the London Academy of June 5th, 1880, in the Introduction refers the ritual of the Atharva-Veda to five *kalpas*: *kāuṣika*, *vāitāna*, *nakṣatra*, *āṅgīrasa*, and *śānti*. It adds the interesting statement that these ritual books belong to four of the nine *śākhās* or *bhedas* into which tradition unanimously divides the Atharva-Veda: namely, the Čaunakīyas, the Aśvalas, the Jaladas, and the Brahmanvādas. I find essentially the same statement in the introduction to the Atharva-paddhati: *atharvavedasya nava bhedā bhavanti : tatra catasṣu śākhāsu čaunakādiṣu kāuṣiko 'yam saṁhītāvidhiḥ . . .* A negative corroboration of this statement is to be derived from the relation of the Kāuṣika and Vāitāna *sūtras* to the one other branch of the Atharva-Veda which has come to light, the Kaṣmīra-recension, which calls itself the Pāippalāda; we know that the *sūtras* do not belong to this *śākhā*, from the technical fact that they cite the *mantras* of the Pāippalāda in full instead of citing the *pratikas*.§ And once the Kāuṣika implicitly confesses itself as *čaunakīya*, in 85. 6, 7, where the opinions of the Čaunakins and Devadargins about measurements are confronted; the opinion of the Čaunakins is given last, and is therefore, in accordance with the usual method of the Kāuṣika, to be considered as the

\* *mīmāṃsāyānī smṛtipāde kalpasūtrādhikaraṇe nakṣatrakalpo vāitānakalpas tṛtīyaḥ saṁhītākalpaḥ caturtha āṅgīrasakalpaḥ śāntīkalpas tu pañcamah : ete kalpā vedatulyā hi 'ti bhagavān (!) upavarṣacāryeṇa pratipāditam : anye kalpāḥ smṛtītulyāḥ*.

† Cf. Gop. Br., ibid. p. 7.

‡ The word *vāitāna* itself is occasionally personified: see Gop. Br., Introduction, p. 4; in the Ath. Paddh. to Kauṣ. 1. 6, the Vāitāna is cited as *čaunakīya-sūtra*.

§ So Kauṣ. 72, 91, 107, 115; Vāit. 10. 17; 14. 1; 24. 1: cf. Roth, Der Atharva-veda in Kaschmir; and Garbe, in the Introduction to the Vāitāna (text), p. vii.

accepted one.\* The prevalence of this canon of five *kalpas* is furthermore attested by the compound *pañcakalpah* in the *Mahābhāṣya*; *pañcakalpah* is probably not to be understood (with Weber, Ind. Stud. xiii. 455) as one studying five different *kalpas*, i. e. *grāuta-sūtras*, but means an Atharvavedin who is familiar with these five *kalpas*.

The gist of these traditions is therefore as follows: There are five ritual books regarded as *ṛuti*, and they are (if we disregard the crooked order in which they are usually presented):

- I. The Kāuṣika-sūtra, known also under the name of Saṁhitā-kalpa, or Saṁhitā-vidhi.
- II. The Vitāna-kalpa, or Vāitāna-sūtra.
- III. The Nakṣatrakalpa.
- IV. The Čānti-kalpa.
- V. The Angirasa-kalpa, known also as Abhicāra-kalpa or Vīdhāna-kalpa.

Accordingly the statement of Weber, Indische Literaturgeschichte, p. 169, is to be corrected. He says, speaking of the Kāuṣika-sūtra: "Zu diesem *sūtra* gehören noch fünf sogenannte *kalpa*: *nakṣatra*, *čānti*, *vitāna* [which he does not identify with the Vāitāna, mentioned on the preceding page], *saṁhitākalpa* [which is itself the Kāuṣika], und *abhicārakalpa*."

So much for the Hindu juxtaposition of the *kalpas*. To the western student of Indian literature, these coördinated five texts are of very different value. To begin with, the Angirasa- or Abhicāra-kalpa has, so far as I know, not as yet turned up in Europe. From the character of the references to it, one can safely guess that it is essentially nothing more than a *pariṣiṣṭa* of the Atharva-Veda, treating mainly *abhicāra*, or witchcraft; and it would probably be of some value in elucidating the sixth book of the Kāuṣika. That the Nakṣatrakalpa and Čāntikalpa are *pariṣiṣṭas* appears from their titles: e. g. Ch. 110 (Weber's Catalogue, p. 89), *brahmavedapariṣiṣṭam nakṣatrakalpābhīdhānam*. In a modern codex of the Ath. *Pariṣiṣṭas*, which Bühler presented

\* A still more incisive difference between the various *čākhās* of the Atharva-Veda is reported in Atharvaparīṣiṣṭa 2. 3, 4. The passage describes the rules for choosing the *purohita*. Not only is an adherent of the three remaining Vedas excluded, but even within the Atharvan itself those belonging to the Māda and Jalada *čākhās* are rejected, while Pāippalādas and Čānuakiyas are considered desirable: *na havāḥ pratigṛhṇanti devatāḥ pitaro dvijāḥ: tasya bhūmipater yasya grhe 'na' tharvavid guruh. samāhilaṅgapratyangavidyācāraguṇānvitam: pāippalādam guruh kuryāt ṛṣiṣṭraṅgyavarādhānam: tathā čānuakinām cā'pi devamantra-vipaçcitam: . . . bahurco hanti vāi rāṣṭram adhvaryur nāçayet sūtān: chandogo dhanam nāçayet tasmād ātharvāno guruh: ajñānād vā pramādād vā yasya syād bahurco guruh: deçarāṣṭrapurāmātyanāças tasya na sañçayaḥ. yadi vā "dhvaryavām rājā niyūnakti purohitam: çastreṇa badhyate kṣipram pariṣiṇārthavāhanah. yathāi 'va parvur adhvānam apaksi cā 'ndabhojanam: evaṁ chandogaguruṇā rājā vṛddhiṁ na gacchati. purodhā jalado yasya māudo vā syāt kathāṁ cana: abdād daçabhyo māsebhyo rāṣṭrabhrāṇaṁ sa gacchati.* Cf. also Yājñavalkya i. 312. On the *čākhās* of the Atharva-Veda cf., in general Indische Studien, i. 296; iii. 277-8; Weber, Omina und Portenta, p. 413; Roth, Der Atharva-Veda in Kaschmir, p. 24 fg; Weber, Indische Literaturgeschichte, p. 166; Rajendralālamitra in the Introduction to the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, p. 5.

to the Royal Library at Berlin (MS. Or. fol. 973), the Nakṣatrakalpa actually stands at the head, and is counted as the first *pariṣiṣṭa*. Of the Berlin codex of the Āntikālpa I possess a copy, but there is to be found in it nothing of great intrinsic interest; nor does the text add anything to the elucidation of either the Kāuṣika or the Vāitāna. The Nakṣatrakalpa in some of its last sections bears upon a few points in the Kāuṣika. A short summary of both texts is to be found in Weber's Nakṣatra II. p. 392 fg.

The two remaining texts contain ritual *sūtras*, but their relation to one another and to the Atharva-saṁhitā is in many respects different from that of corresponding texts in the *cākhās* of the other Vedas. The doubtful canonicity of the Atharva-Veda (which gains expression in the prevailing designation of the Vedas as a *trāividyam* or *trayi vidyā*), or at least the patent fact that the hymns of the Atharva-Veda are not well-fitted for employment in the *grāuta*-ritual, has left its stamp on the *grāuta*-literature. This is both secondary and scarce; its only *brāhmaṇa*, the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, and its *grāuta-sūtra*, the Vāitāna, no doubt belong to the latest products of their respective kinds of literature. They are perhaps merely imitations of the literary conditions in vogue in the *caranās* of the other Vedas. On the other hand, the private life and the private performances of one who adhered to the Veda of incantation and exorcisms naturally were very extensive, bringing in much which was unknown in other Vedic schools; and to this the largest and most important ritual text of the Atharva-Veda, the Kāuṣika-sūtra, owes its peculiarly prominent position among the Atharvan books.

As a rule, the *grhya-sūtras* are dependent upon the *grāuta-sūtras*; the former refer to the latter familiarly, and do not describe a second time performances which have been treated in the *grāuta-sūtra*. So Pārask. i. 1. 4 and i. 18. 1 refers to Kāty. Ār., with the expression *pūrvavat*, 'as above.\* In the collection of the *sūtra-carāṇa* of Āpastamba, in which all religious *sūtras* are united into one work, the *grāuta-sūtra* precedes the *grhya*. Stenzler, in the preface to his edition of the Aṣv. Gr., p. iii., remarks: "The chief obstacle in the way of a correct understanding of the *grhya-sūtras* lies in the fact that they appear as appendices to the *grāuta*-rules, and presuppose an acquaintance with the *grāuta*-performances."†

Nothing corresponding to this is to be found in the correlation of the Kāuṣika and the Vāitāna. There is no point in which the Kāuṣika depends upon the Vāitāna; on the other hand, the dependence of the Vāitāna upon the Kāuṣika is apparent at almost every step, where the difference of the subject-matter, and the difference between Vedic ceremonial and house ceremonial, allow it. The position of the Vāitāna may therefore perhaps be described as follows: it is not the product of practices in Vedic ceremonies which have slowly and gradually developed in a cer-

\* Pāraskara's *sūtra* is called outright Kāṭiya-sūtra, or Pāraskara's Kāṭiya-sūtra.

† Cf. e. g. Aṣv. Gr. i. 5. 1; iv. 1. 16; 4. 6.

tain school, but probably a somewhat conscious product, made at a time when Atharvavedins, in the course of their polemics with the priests of the other Vedas, began to feel the need of a manual for Vedic practices which should be distinctly Atharvanic. That the Atharvan is poorly fitted for serving as foundation to a Vedic ritual can be seen from the fact that very little that distinctly belongs to its proper sphere (*carmina, devotiones*), and at the same time is not borrowed, or does not at least occur in the Kāuṣika, is found in the Vāitāna. On the other hand, it contains numerous verses and formulas from the Yajus-saṁhitās; and in the description of the ritual it follows very closely Kātyāyana's Ġrāuta-sūtra. In Vāit. i. 1. 8, *devatā havir daksinā yajurvedāt*, 'the authority for the divinities, the sacrificial material, and the sacrificial reward, is from the Yajur-Veda,' we seem to find formal recognition of this fact. And perhaps it may be taken as a sign of intimacy between the Vāitāna and Kātyāyana, that the commentary to the latter cites the Vāitāna quite frequently, under the names of Vāitāna-sūtra, Ātharvaṇa, and Atharva-sūtra (cf. Garbe, preface to text, p. vi.). On the other hand, the relation of the Vāitāna to the Kāuṣika may be described by stating that the Vāitāna treats the Kāuṣika almost as though it were another *saṁhitā*, taking for granted that the ritual of the Kāuṣika, and the *mantras* which it quotes from other sources than the *vulgata*, are understood and known by its readers.

The Vāitāna-sūtra we possess in an excellent edition and translation by Richard Garbe (text, London, 1878; translation, Strassburg, 1878). Before bringing detailed evidence for the statements made, we may collect here a few addenda and corrigenda, most of which come from sources which were inaccessible to Garbe.

Vāit. 1. 19: *jīvābhīr* is translated by 'mit *jīvā*wasser.' Dārila to Kāuṣ. 3. 4 explains *jīvābhīr* by *jīvā sthe 'ti catasr̥bhiḥ*: i. e. 'with the *jīvā*-verses' (AV. xix. 69. 1-4).

Vāit. 10. 5: *gandhapravādābhīr* is translated 'mit Stoffen welche als wolriechend zu bezeichnen sind.' According to the Daṣa karmāṇi to Kāuṣ. 54. 4, the *gandhapravādā ṛcas* are AV. xii. 1. 23-25, all beginning with the words *yas te gandhaḥ*.

Vāit. 24. 3: *apām sūktāir*. The hymns to the waters are given as follows by Dārila to Kāuṣ. 7. 14: *ambayo yanti, gambhumayo-bhū, hiraṇyavarṇādayaḥ, kṛṣṇaṁ nīyānam, sasruṣir, himavataḥ pra sravanti, vāyoḥ pūta ity apām sūktāni* (AV. i. 4. 1; 5. 1; 6. 1; 33. 1; vi. 22. 1; 23. 1; 24. 1; 51. 1).

Vāit. 37. 23: *utthāpanībhīr*, 'mit den *utthāpanī*-Versen.' According to the Antyeṣṭikarman (a *paddhati* on the burial-ceremonies) to Kāuṣ. 81. 31, these verses are AV. xviii. 3. 8, 9; 2. 48; 1. 61; 2. 53; 4. 44.

Vāit. 37. 24: *harinībhīh*, 'mit den *harinī*-Versen.' According to the Antyeṣṭikarman (ibid.), they are AV. xviii. 2. 11-18.

The passage Vāit. 5. 10, treating of the preparation of the *śāntiyudaka*, the only one in the text which Garbe finds himself

compelled to leave untranslated, will be explained below, in another connection.

Several of the *pratīkas* cited, whose origin was unknown to Garbe,\* can be found in the vulgata by the aid of Whitney's Index Verborum: thus, Vāit. 3. 17, *indra gīrbhik*, is AV. vii. 110. 3<sup>c</sup>; Vāit. 9. 4, *pūrṇā darve*, is AV. iii. 10. 7<sup>c</sup>; Vāit. 8. 6, *indrāgnī asmān*, is AV. x. 1. 21<sup>a</sup>; Vāit. 28. 32, *kṛte yonāu*, is AV. iii. 17. 2<sup>b</sup>. The *pratīka* in Vāit. 16. 1, *pūrṇam adhvaryo pra bhara*, and the following verse, which is referred to in sūtra 2, are probably a modification of AV. iii. 12. 8, 9: *pūrṇam nāri pra bhara*.†

The quantity of material in the Vāitāna which is characteristically Atharvanic is quite small, if we exclude what is shared with it by the Kāṇḍika. In Vāit. 1. 1, the demand is made that the supervising priest, the *brahman*, shall be a *brahmavedavid*. The expression *brahmaveda* does not occur in the Kāṇḍika; in its place Kāṇḍ. 63. 3 and 94. 3, and the Vāitāna itself in 1. 5, have the more archaic *bhr̥gvāgirovid*; and Vāit. 11. 2 still further exhibits the expression *atharvāgirovidam brahmānam*. In the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa and the *pariṣistas*, also, the expression *bhr̥gvāgirovid* prevails;‡ *brahmavedavid*§ probably belongs to a later period. On several occasions, the Vāitāna takes it upon itself directly or indirectly to express the superiority of the Atharva-Veda and its priests. In 11. 2, it does so by giving precedence to the *atharvāgirovid* who shall be chosen as *brahman* (in the technical sense) over the *udgātar*, *hotar*, and *adhvaryu*. This precedence of the Atharvan appears in a more valuable form, because impliedly, in the *mantra*-passage Vāit. 6. 1: the fire compared to a steed is addressed with *taṁ tvā 'dadhur brahmaṇe bhāgam agre atharvāṇaḥ sāmavedo yajūṁṣi: ṛgbhik pūtam prajāpatiṛ atharvaṇe 'śvam prathamam nināya*. In the *mantra*-passage Vāit. 37. 2, the *brahman* carries on a petty polemic against the other priests participating in the sacrifice, saying: "You are not a guardian of the sacrifice higher than I; you are not better, more excellent, do not stand above me; you do indeed speak instructively, but you must not place yourself on a level with me." This accords again with the polemical tone of the later Atharvan-literature, especially the *pariṣistas* (cf. the extract from Ath. Pariṣ. 2. 3, 4 above), in which all possible effort, and sometimes virulent language, is expended upon the

\* See text, p. 81.

† I have noted the following errata: in the preface to the text, p. vi., read *abhicāresv* etc. 2. 10, instead of . . . 2. 12; text 1. 18, *vāg* for *vag*; 2. 1, *brahmann* for *brahyann*; 25. 1, *osadhīr* for *osāsīr*; 28. 11, *phāṇta* for *pāṇta*; 28. 12, *bhāgali* for *bhagali*. In the translation, 34. 11, *uccāirghosa* for *-gosa*.

‡ See Gop. Br. i. 2. 24; 3. 1; and, for the *pariṣistas*, Weber, *Omina und Portenta*, p. 346.

§ It is indeed quite obvious that the original *brahman* in Vedic sacrifices was not connected with the Atharva-Veda at all, but was supposed to know the three other Vedas, in distinction from the *hotar*, *udgātar*, and *adhvaryu*, who each knew only one. Thus the *brahman* is fitted for his office of supervisor of the sacrifice, in which he would receive but little aid from a knowledge of the Atharvan: cf. Haug, *Brahma und die Brahmanen*, p. 10; Müller, in the *Journal of the German Oriental Society*, vol. ix., p. xlvii.



task of showing the dignity of the *brahman*-priest and his Veda. Curiously enough, this effort is not restricted to Atharvan-writings; e. g. in the *Mahābhāṣya* the Atharvan consistently receives the first position among the Vedas (Ind. Stud. xiii. 433 fg.) ; Yājñavalkya, i. 312, demands that the *purohita* shall be acquainted with the *Atharvāṅgīrasas* ; and even in the *gṛhya-sūtras* of the Rig-Veda (Çāṅkh. iv. 10. 3 ; Çāmbavyagr̥hya, Ind. Stud. xv. 153 ; Aṣṭv. iii. 4. 4), on the occasion of the *tarpanam*, the Atharva-ṛṣi Sumantu, whom tradition unanimously designates as the first source of Atharvan-lore,\* is honored with the first place in the list of sages. In addition, there is very little Atharvan-material which belongs especially to the Vāitāna : thus, 2. 10, *āsādīteṣu haviṣṣū 'ktān purastāddhomān juhōti : abhicāreṣv abhicārikān*, and 43. 25, *çāunakayajño 'bhicārakāmasya*, bring in *abhicāra* in an independent way — moreover, the *çāunaka*-sacrifice is unknown elsewhere. The passage describing the *çāntyudaka*, which will be translated below, also contains a special contribution of the Vāitāna to Atharvan-practices ; and Vāit. 1. 3 contains an interesting *paribhāṣā-sūtra*, in which are given the dictates of several Atharvan teachers concerning the expedients which are to be resorted to when no *mantra* is prescribed for an oblation. Further, the Vāitāna quotes independently and in full three hymns of the Kashmīr-branch, the Pāippalāda (in 10. 17 ; 14. 1 ; 24. 1), just as the Kāuṣika and Gopatha Brāhmaṇa quote hymns and verses of the same version : see Roth, Der Atharva Veda in Kaschmir, p. 23. That the hymns of the vulgata are cited largely, and only with their *pratīkas*, proves nothing for the archaic character of the work ; the author of a *grānta-sūtra* to any Vedic collection, at any period whatever, would observe this practice and the technicalities attached thereto.

As indicated above, the few points mentioned are far from exhausting the materials in the Vāitāna which are characteristically Atharvanic. But those remaining cannot be adduced as testimony in favor of the originality and age of the text, because the Vāitāna shares them with the Kāuṣika.

The points of contact between these two texts in general are very numerous. In the matter of external form, it may be worth noting that the Vāitāna-sūtra proper, which is divided into eight *adhyāyas*, is frequently found extended to fourteen *adhyāyas* by the addition of *prāyaścitta-sūtras*. So in one of the manuscripts which Garbe used in his edition, and in a codex presented to the Royal Library at Berlin by Prof. Eggeling (MS. or. oct. 343). This may have been done in deference to the fourteen *adhyāyas* of the Kāuṣika. The Vāitāna as well as the Kāuṣika frequently begins a chapter with a long *mantra*-passage which belongs to the action of the preceding chapter : so Vāit. 6, 12,† 14, 24 ; and Kāuṣ. 2, 3, 4, 5, 70, 88, etc. etc. I have not noticed in the Vāitāna the

\* Viṣṇupurāṇa iii. 6 ; Vāyup. 60 ; Bhāgavatap. xii. 7. 1 ; cf. Roth, Der Atharva Veda in Kaschmir, p. 26.

† So also Gop. Br. i. 3. 22.

practice, common in the Kāuṣika, of disregarding hiatus produced by *sandhi*: so Kāuṣ. 6. 17, *patnyāñjalāu* = *patnyā(h) añjalāu*; 6. 34, *dāivateti* = *dāivata(y) iti*; 17. 3, *talpārsabham* = *talpa(y) ārsabham*; cf. also the seven cases mentioned by Weber in his *Omina* and Portenta, p. 390, note 3. But both texts (Vāit. 7. 15; 28. 26: Kāuṣ. 87. 23; 88. 29, etc.) have a case of peculiar *sandhi* in the words *pitryupavīta* and *pitryupavītin*.\* Each text has once a nominative plur. in *-ayas* employed as accusative: Vāit. 11. 24, *angusthaprabhrtayas tisa ucchrayet*, 'he shall lift up the first three fingers beginning with the thumb'; Kāuṣ. 8. 19, *trayodacyādayas tiso dadhimadhuni vāsayitvā badhnāti*, 'he ties on the amulet after having kept it in a mixture of sour milk and honey during the three nights beginning with the night of the thirteenth.' The parallelism between *prabhrtayas tisas* and *-adayas tisas* is hardly accidental. Both texts frequently introduce *śloka*-passages describing or complementing in metrical form what has been previously described or indicated in *sūtras*. So Vāit. 4. 23 and 9. 12 are introduced by *tad api ślokāu vadataḥ*; 19. 20 and 20. 4 and 11 by *tatra ślokaḥ*; 31. 15 by *tad etac chloko bhivadati*; and Kāuṣ. 6. 34 by *athā 'pi ślokāu bhavataḥ*; 68. 35 by *tatra ślokāu*; 74. 10 by *tad api śloko vadati*. Both texts occasionally refer to the Brāhmaṇa with the phrase *brāhmaṇoktam* or *iti brāhmaṇam*; the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa is not the text referred to. So Vāit. 7. 25, *brāhmaṇoktam agnyupasthānam*, 'the approach of the fire is described in the Brāhmaṇa'; 17. 11, *brāhmaṇoktān ity anubrāhmaṇināḥ*, which Garbe translates, hesitatingly, 'the Anubrāhmaṇin employ the things prescribed in the Brāhmaṇa'; 31. 1, . . . *sattram upayanto brāhmaṇoktena dikseran*, 'those entering upon a *sattra* shall consecrate themselves in the way described in the Brāhmaṇa'; so also the word *brāhmaṇa* in 43. 45. In the same way Kāuṣ. 6. 22, *nā 'daksinaṁ haviḥ kurvīta: yaḥ kurute kṛtyām ātmanāḥ kuruta iti brāhmaṇam*; 80. 2, *dahananidhānadeṣe parivṛkṣāṇi nidhānakāla iti brāhmaṇoktam*.† So also *brāhmaṇoktam* in 58. 3. The Vāitāna lapses into the broad *brāhmaṇa*-style at the end (43. 46): *ya imāu kalpāv adhīte ya u cāi 'vām veda tena sarvāḥ kratubhīr iṣṭam bhavati sarvāṅś ca kāmān āpnoti*. This occurs quite frequently in the Kāuṣika: e. g. the long passage 6. 23–28, 67. 3; and especially 73. 28. Both texts employ very frequently the expression *mantrokta*, 'the person or thing mentioned in the mantra whose *pratīka* is cited.' So Vāit. 1. 14, *sinivālī prthustuka iti mantroktām*, 'with the versé "O Sinivālī with the broad braids" he addresses the divinity mentioned in the mantra'; 5. 7, *agnim aṣvathād iti . . . mantrokte arāṇi gṛhṇantāṁ vācayati*. So also 11. 15; 30. 27; 31. 4. Very much more frequently this occurs in the Kāuṣika: e. g. *yad yat kṛṣṇa iti mantroktam*, 'with the verse "whatever is black" he does what is stated in

\* So also Gop. Br. i. 3. 12.

† Ātharvaṇiya-paddhati: *dahanasthāne vṛkṣavarjite deṣe nidhānakāla iti brāhmaṇoktam*.

the *mantra*:' i. e. he polishes the mortar and pestle. So also Kāuṣ. 21. 11; 23. 14; 26. 14; 31. 17, 21; 32. 5, etc. Worthy of note also is the frequent employment of the solemn exclamation *janat* in addition to *bhūs*, *bhūvas*, *svar*. According to the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa i. 1. 8, this is symbolic of the *āṅgīrasa*, i. e. the Atharva-Veda. So Vāit. 1. 3, 18; 2. 1; 8. 3; 17. 4; 18. 17; 30. 15; Kāuṣ. 3. 4; 55. 1; 69. 22; 70. 6; 90. 18; 91. 9, etc. Furthermore, the two texts share many technical terms, which are entirely restricted to the Atharvan-ritual or occur preponderatingly in it. So the *purastāddhoma* and *saṁsthitahoma*, an introductory and a final oblation of melted butter, are peculiar to the Atharva-Veda. They occur also in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. The terms *sarūpavatsā*, 'a cow with a calf of the same color as herself,' and its derivative *sārūpavatsam*, 'milk from such a cow,' occur very frequently in the Kāuṣika; the latter occurs also once in Vāit. 12. 14. The terms *sampāta*, 'dregs or residue of an offering,' and *sampātavant*, though not restricted to the Atharva-Veda ritual—they occur also in Gobhila, and are explained in the Gṛhyasamgraha i. 113—occur with especial frequency in the Kāuṣika; in the Vāitāna, 12. 14, we have once *sampātavant*; *sampāta* occurs twice: 31. 25; 32. 7.\* The term *ākṛtiloṣṭa*, 'natural lump of mud,'† occurs once in Vāit. 5. 12; it occurs very frequently in the Kāuṣika, as will be seen below. The *śāntiyudaka* occurs once (5. 10) in the Vāitāna, but very frequently in the Kāuṣika; the latter gives in the 9th chapter a full description of its preparation, which is expanded still further by the *paddhatis*.‡ The peculiar abstract *rasaprācānī*, 'eating of broth,' occurs twice in the Vāitāna (21. 20; 30. 6); once also in the Kāuṣika (21. 19). The word *purodāṣa-saṁvarta* in the sense of *purodāṣa-pinda* occurs once in each text (Vāit. 22. 22: Kāuṣ. 30. 17). Each text has once the dvandva *yāmasārāsnata* (Vāit. 37. 26: Kāuṣ. 83. 16). Further, the teachers mentioned in the Vāitāna occur in the Kāuṣika, and the designations of *gaṇas*, 'strings of hymns,' as also of single hymns of prominent character and wide application, and groups of verses, are essentially the same: the *cātanānī*, *apām sūktānī*, *śambhūmayobhū*, and *āṣāpāliya* hymns, the *gandhapravādā*, *jīvā*, *utthāpanī* verses occur in both texts: see below, p. 386. Finally, there are about sixty passages in the Vāitāna, in which the ritual described shows a more or less close resemblance to performances in the Kāuṣika; the resemblance sometimes amounts to absolute identity, and from that shades off to mere similarity in the arrangement of certain details, in the employment of hymns, etc.§

\* Cf. Gop. Br. ii. 6. 1. fg.; Weber, Omina und Portenta, p. 377; Garbe translates *sampātavant* in Vāit. 12. 14 incorrectly by 'welche er (in der Milch von einer eben geschilderten Kuh) zubereitet hat.'

† Darila fol. 42\*, l. 10 (to Kāuṣ. 8. 16): *ākṛtiloṣṭaḥ kṣetraloṣṭaḥ*.

‡ Cf. also Gop. Br. i. 2. 18.

§ The following is a concordance of these passages:

It would certainly be going too far to suppose that the Vāitāna has drawn upon the Kāuṣika for all these numerous correspondences; it is very probable that many of the Atharvan specialties of both texts were simply current in Atharvan-schools, in such a way that they would be at the bidding of the compiler of a religious manual at any time. So there are at present, as far as I know, no means of deciding whether or not the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa is anterior to the Vāitāna, in spite of the many correspondences, which in a number of places rise to absolute identity: Vāit. 2. 15 = Gop. Br. i. 5. 21; Vāit. 3. 10 = Gop. Br. ii. 1. 2; Vāit. 3. 12: Gop. Br. ii. 1. 3; Vāit. 3. 20: Gop. Br. ii. 1. 7; Vāit. 5. 10: Gop. Br. i. 2. 18; Vāit. 5. 18: Gop. Br. i. 2. 18; Vāit. 11. 1: Gop. Br. ii. 1. 16; Vāit. 12. 1: Gop. Br. i. 3. 22; Vāit. 16. 15: Gop. Br. ii. 2. 12, etc. But in looking over the parallels between the Vāitāna and the Kāuṣika, it is found that the Vāitāna frequently exhibits a certain fact or series of facts in a fragmentary way, merely presenting sundry features of a group of facts, which the Kāuṣika exhibits apparently in full. This occurs in so marked a manner that the lesser bulk of the Vāitāna does not suffice to explain it away. The Vāitāna, for example, mentions teachers here and there: Kāuṣika, Yuvan Kāuṣika, Bhāgali, Māṭhara, Čaunaka. There occurs in addition only the expression *ācāryāḥ* (1. 3; 5. 13; 7. 16), which Garbe, following a suggestion of Bühler's, regards

Vāitāna.	Kāuṣika.	Vāitāna.	Kāuṣika.
1. 1, 5	64. 3; 94. 3	10. 3	8. 13
1. 11	1. 32	10. 4	88. 16
1. 13	1. 33; 73. 13	10. 5	13. 12; 54. 4
1. 16	5. 5	11. 2	64. 3; 94. 3
1. 19	3. 4	11. 13	82. 11
1. 20	3. 5; 137. 33	11. 14	24. 28
2. 2	2. 6	11. 24	8. 19
2. 4	6. 23	12. 7	57. 5
2. 5	137. 11, 15	15. 15	3. 4
2. 6	76. 6	16. 6	23. 1
3. 5	5. 12	16. 15	57. 5
3. 12	9. 2	16. 17	6. 1
3. 20	6. 23	17. 4	108. 2
4. 7	6. 9	18. 2	62. 1; 68. 17
4. 11	76. 26	20. 9	88. 29; 89. 1
4. 13	6. 4	21. 9	68. 6
4. 22	6. 19; 42. 15; 68. 33	21. 20	21. 19
5. 10	8. 16	22. 22	30. 17
5. 15	70. 1	24. 3	7. 14; 140. 17
5. 18	7. 21	24. 7	6. 11
6. 11	1. 31	24. 14	40. 10
6. 12	1. 35; 82. 44	28. 30	20. 1
7. 4	3. 4	34. 11	16. 1
7. 6	3. 9	34. 12	16. 7
7. 15	87. 23; 88. 29	36. 7	17. 1
7. 20	6. 20	37. 23	82. 31; 83. 23
8. 6	5. 2	37. 24	82. 31; 83. 23
9. 4	138. 11	37. 26	83. 16
9. 8	87. 7	38. 1	97. 7
9. 20	84. 10	38. 4	88. 29; 89. 1
10. 2	8. 12	43. 7	4. 18

as *pluralis majesticus*, and translates by 'my teacher.' The Kāuṇika has all of these excepting the *ācāryās*, and in addition knows the following worthies: Gārgya, Pārthagravasa, Kānkāyana, Paribabhrava, Jātikāyana, Kāurupathi, Isuphāli and Deva-darṣa. The same superiority of the Kāuṇika is exhibited in the employment of *gaṇas* (hymn-lists) and verse-lists. The Vāitāna knows the following list of designations, which is approximately exhaustive: the *cātana*, *mātrṇāma*, and *vāstospatiya gaṇas*, the *apām sūktāni*, the *sampāta*-hymns; the *gaṃbhumayobhū*-hymns, the *madhu-sūkta*, the *ācāpātiya*-hymn, the *sahasrabāhu*-hymn; the *jīvā*, the *gandhapravādā*, the *utthāpanī*, and the *harinī*-verses. The Kāuṇika has all of these, excepting the designations *madhu-sūkta*, *sampāta*, and *sahasrabāhu-sūkta*; and in addition the *brhat* and *laghu-ṣānti-gaṇas*, the *salīla-gaṇa*, the *abhaya-gaṇa*, the *mṛgāra-sūktāni*, the *sāmmanasyāni*, *sāmgrāmikāni*, and *vār-casyāni sūktāni*; the *ṣāntāti*-hymn, the *gaṃbhanī*-hymn, the *sān-natī*-verses, the *anholingā*-verses, the two verses called *dig-yukte*, etc. etc. The *paribhāṣā-sūtras* for the Kāuṇika proper are contained in chapters 7 and 8; the first six chapters, treating the *darṣapūrnamāsa*-ceremonies, I think can be proved to be of later origin: or, at least, their conjunction with the parts following has taken place after the bulk of the text was fixed. These *paribhāṣās* find but little application in the Vāitāna; but we have two of the rules practically employed in 10. 2 and 3: *arātīyor iti yūpani vr̥ccyamānam anumantrayate* (Kāuṇ. 8. 12: *arātīyor iti takṣatī*); *yat tvā cikva iti prakṣālyamānam* (Kāuṇ. 8. 13: *yat tvā cikva iti prakṣālayatī*). The term *ākṛtiloṣṭa* occurs but once in the Vāitāna; in the Kāuṇika it occurs frequently (8. 16; 21. 2; 25. 7; 37. 8; 60. 15; 69. 11, etc.), and plays a prominent part in its practices, occurring frequently in connection with *valmīkalosṭa* or *valmīkavapā*, 'lump of mud with ants:' both of these are mentioned in the *paribhāṣā-sūtra* 8. 16 as *ṣānta*, 'holy.' The *ṣāntiyudaka*, 'holy water,' occurs but once (5. 10) in the Vāitāna, in a passage which in part refers to the Kāuṇika; the latter devotes the ninth chapter to a description of its preparation, and its application is very common in the performances of the personal sacraments (the *saṃskāras*). Again, both texts have the *upavatsyadbhukta*, 'fast-day-food, eaten on the day preceding solemn sacrifices;' the Kāuṇika, 1. 32, defines it as 'diet from which honey, salt, meat, and beans are excluded.' And the sporadic occurrence in the Vāitāna of the terms *sārūpavatsa* and *sampāta*, which are so characteristic of the Kāuṇika, testifies to the fact that they are taken from the ritual of that text.

There is, however, stronger evidence than this for the dependence of the Vāitāna upon the Kāuṇika. In several passages, one of which is especially important, the Vāitāna refers to ritual described in detail in the Kāuṇika, indicating merely the first and last traits of the performance: thus, Vāit. 1. 19, *jīvābhīr ācamye 'ityādiprapadanāntam*, 'he performs the rite at the beginning of which he rinses his mouth, accompanying the act with utterance

of the *jīvā*-verses, and which ends with the *prapad*-formula;’ Kāuṣika 3. 4, *jīvābhir ācamyo ’potthāya vedaprapadbhiḥ prapadyata om prapadye bhūḥ prapadye bhuvāḥ prapadye svāḥ prapadye janat prapadya iti.\** Again, Vāit. 11. 14: *daksinenā ’gnim kacipvetyādiviḥśanāntam*, ‘south of the fire he performs the rite which commences with the spreading of the cushion and ends with contemplation.’ This refers to quite a long passage from the Kāuṣika, 24. 26–31. And in the same manner Vāit. 24. 3, *apāni sūktāir ityādyupaspārśanāntam*, ‘he performs the ceremony which begins with bathing, accompanied by the recitation of the hymns to the waters, and which ends with the touching of the water,’ refers to Kāuṣ. 7. 14 and 140. 17. And Vāit. 24. 7, *vi muñcāmityādimārjanāntam*, ‘he performs the act which begins with the recital of the mantra *vi muñcāmi* and ends with the act of drying (the face),’ refers to Kāuṣ. 6. 11–13.†

Sound as this evidence seems to be at first sight, I confess that I cannot regard it as a final proof that the Vāitāna has in such cases actually borrowed from the Kāuṣika. It might well be possible that we have here ritualistic acts common and familiar in the Atharvan schools reported independently by the two texts, and that it is due merely to difference of style and method that the Kāuṣika reports them in full, while the Vāitāna only sketches their outline. And it is worth noting that the Vāitāna never mentions the Kāuṣika as the source from which these outlines may be filled in. The much stronger evidence which the passage describing the *śāntiyudaka* (5. 10) furnishes is therefore welcome. The passage reads: *usasi śāntiyudakam karoti cityādibhir ātharvanibhiḥ kapurvīparvārodākāvṛkkāvatinādāniridahanatibhir āngirasibhiḥ ca*. Garbe finds himself unable to translate it, and remarks in the critical notes: “For this incurably corrupt passage the unanimous reading of all MSS. is given, as no explanation can be obtained from the Atharvānukramāṇi, out of which I have prepared an index of *ṛṣis* and *devatās*.” Garbe is misled by the supposition that the words *cityādibhir ātharvanibhiḥ*, and the corresponding passage ending with *āngirasibhiḥ*, refer to certain kinds of hymns. The meaning of the passage becomes clear in the light of the *paribhāṣā-sūtra* Kāuṣ. 8. 16: *citi-prāyaścitti-†camī-*

\* In the same manner the Vāitāna refers to practices which have been described in its own preceding chapters. So 15. 15, *ācamanādiviḥśanāntam*, ‘he performs the rite which begins with the rinsing of the mouth and ends with the act of contemplation.’ This refers back to Vāit. 1. 19.

† Noteworthy are three other passages, in which ritualistic practices are sketched in the same manner, by giving their initial and final traits; neither Garbe nor myself have found anything in either Vāitāna or Kāuṣika which fills in the outline. They are Vāit. 5. 12, *ākṛtiloṣṭetyādyupasthānāntam*; 10. 14, *paṇāv ānayāi ’tamityādy ānjanāntam*; 16. 15, *havir upāvahrta ityādivāicvānaro ’gnīṣṭoma ityanābhiḥ*. Were there ever other ritualistic *sūtra*-collections in the Atharvan schools?

‡ Dārila comments upon these words as follows: *citiḥ prāyaścitiḥ svacitiḥ prāyaścitiḥ dvandvāḥ tādhyām evamvidhātādhyām varāṇena siddhibhūmīsthavartulaprasiddhe: metra prāyaścittivijṇeṣaḥ: trīṇi trīṇi sarvāṇi parvaṇi ubhe śatamejakāre*. I give the text without emending even the most obvious errors.

*çamakā-savañçā-çāmyavākā-talāçā-palāçā-vāçā-çinçapā-çimbala-sipuna-darbhā-'pamārgā-'kṛtiloṣṭa-valmīkavapā-dūrvāprānta-vrīhi-yavāḥ çāntāḥ.* This is a list of articles, largely plants, which are considered as holy, and are therefore employed in the preparation of the *çāntyudaka*, 'the holy water.' In the Vāitāna they are called *ātharvāna*, and are contrasted with the list following, which is called *āngirasa*. This does not occur in the Kāuçika. In this case there can be no doubt that the Vāitāna, in abbreviating the first list, which does occur in the Kāuçika, so as to say 'with the articles *citi* etc.,' and in giving in full the second list, which does not occur in the Kāuçika,\* confesses itself directly dependent on and later than the Kāuçika.

We have finally a technical proof. Both texts follow the usual practice of citing the hymns belonging to the canon of their own school by their *pratīkas*. The Kāuçika moreover follows the current method of giving in full any hymns or *formulæ solennes* which come from another *çākhā* of the same Veda, as well as from the other Vedas. The Vāitāna in general follows the same practice, with one very noticeable exception. Any hymn or formula which occurs in the Kāuçika as well as in the Vāitāna is cited with the *pratīka* only, it matters not whether the hymn in question occur also in some other *saṁhitā*, or is, as seems often the case, the special property of the Kāuçika, not to be found in any of the existing *saṁhitās*. An example or two may illustrate this statement.

The Tāittirīya-saṁhitā, iii. 2. 4. 4, has the formula: *ahe dāidhi-savyo 'd atas tiṣṭhā 'nyasya sadane sīda yo 'smat pākatarah.* This is cited in full in the *çrāuta-sūtra* of the White Yajur Veda, Kāty. ii. 1. 22. So also Kāuç. 3. 5; but Vāit. 1. 20 has only the *pratīka*: *ahe dāidhiṣavya.*

Kāuç. 6. 11 has a *mantra*, which Dārila designates as *kalpajā*, and which I have not been able to trace in any *saṁhitā*: *vi muñcāmi brahmanā jātavedasam agniṁ hotāram ājaram rathasmṛtam*, etc. Vāit. 24. 7 cites only the *pratīka*: *vi muñcāmi.*

\* One may venture to state that the *āngirasakalpa* would bring some explanation of these obscure terms. Compare also Gop. Br. i. 2. 18.